
1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Lang called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. on Thursday, January 11, 2007.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3 ROLL CALL

Present were Commissioners Boime, Didier, Lang, Malandrino, Ruffatto and Steilen were present. Commissioner Dorband gave prior notice of her absence. Also present were Andrew Jennings, Village Planner and Samantha Robinson, Associate Village Planner.

4. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

Mr. Jennings reported the following changes to the agenda:

- Item B) Docket No. SCBA 07-1 (Priester wall sign) has requested to be put on a later agenda in order to work out a couple of issues.
- Item D) Docket No. 2006-33/PC 06-31 (Lang Subdivision) has been removed from the agenda since they are still in the process of responding to the requests of the Village Board.

5. ITEMS FOR REVIEW

- A)** Previous Docket No. SCBA 06-50
Gale's Coffee
601 North Milwaukee Avenue (within Westin Hotel)
Approval of Modification to Awning Signage

The petitioner was not present at the meeting.

Mr. Jennings reported the petitioner had expressed concern that the business name would get lost with the proposed color scheme. The petitioner is proposing cream on the brown awning and removing the fill inside the oval. He was uncertain as to the reason the petitioner was not present.

Commissioner Didier was in agreement to the change.

Commissioner Ruffatto preferred the original colors.

Commissioner Steilen preferred using a little color for visibility.

Commissioner Malandrino was in agreement to the change.

Commissioner Boime suggested changing the letters to brown and keeping the cream. Mr. Jennings indicated the proposed change was the only one he had received from the petitioner. Commissioner Boime understood the need for more contrast but wanted to hear the petitioner's comments.

Chairman Lang felt the sign was boring. He agreed with Commissioner Boime's suggestion.

Chairman Lang took a poll regarding changing it to brown letters with a cream background. The entire Commission was in favor of the suggestion. If the petitioner agreed, the Commission did not need to have the petitioner return.

Commissioner Boime moved, seconded by Commissioner Didier to approve previous Docket No. SCBA 06-50 Appearance Approval of an Awning Sign for Gale's Coffee Bar as shown on the sign graphics dated December 7, 2006 and submitted December 28, 2006 by Thatcher Oaks Awnings on behalf of Gale's Coffee Bar, located at the Westin North Shore, 601 North Milwaukee Avenue, Wheeling, Illinois with the following condition:

- Reverse the design to brown text on a cream oval

On the roll call, the vote was as follows:

AYES: Commissioners Boime, Didier, Lang, Malandrino, Ruffatto, Steilen
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Dorband
PRESENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

There being six affirmative votes, the motion was approved.

- B)** Docket No. SCBA 07-1
Priester Aviation
1061 S. Wolf Road
Approval of a Business Identification Wall Sign

Item removed from agenda.

- C)** Docket No. SCBA 07-2
Furniture Club
149 South Milwaukee Avenue
Approval of a Business Identification Wall Sign

Mr. Daniel Konovaltchik, DK Sign Co. was present.

In response to Commissioner Steilen's question, Mr. Konovaltchik confirmed the upper and lower portions of the sign were illuminated.

Commissioner Malandrino had no questions.

Commissioner Didier had no questions.

Commissioner Boime requested that the façade get repaired before the sign is installed.

Commissioner Ruffatto had no questions.

Chairman Lang agreed the façade needed to be repaired. He questioned how the petitioner would repair it. Mr. Konovaltchik agreed to contact the landlord. Chairman Lang requested that the entire façade get re-shingled if needed, rather than just re-shingling above the subject unit. If possible, just repair the specific area with raised or damaged shingles.

Commissioner Didier moved, seconded by Commissioner Steilen to approve Docket No. SCBA 07-2 to permit installation of a business identification wall sign in accordance with the sign specification sheet prepared by DK Sign Co., submitted on January 4, 2007, on behalf of Furniture Club, located at 149 South Milwaukee Avenue, Wheeling, Illinois.

On the roll call, the vote was as follows:

AYES: Commissioners Didier, Lang, Malandrino, Ruffatto, Steilen
NAYS: Commissioner Boime
ABSENT: Commissioner Dorband
PRESENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

There being five affirmative votes, the motion was approved.

- D)** Docket No. 2006-33/PC 06-31
(REFERRED BACK TO THE PC BY THE VILLAGE BOARD)
Lang Subdivision
111 and 123 South Wolf Road
(2006-33) Variation from Title 17, Planning, Subdivisions and Developments,
relating to length of cul-de-sac (Lilac Lane)
(PC 06-31) Preliminary Plat Approval of a Four-Lot Single-Family Subdivision

Item removed from the agenda.

- E)** Docket No. 2006-42 **CONTINUED FROM 12.21.2006**
ABC and 1,2,3 Academy
710 South Milwaukee Avenue (within The Elms at 700-728)
Special Use to Operate an Early Childhood Specialty and Personal Instruction
School

See Findings of Fact and Recommendation for Docket No. 2006-42.

Commissioner Boime moved, seconded by Commissioner Malandrino to recommend approval of Docket No. 2006-42 Special Use and Associated Site Plan Approval to permit an Early Childhood Specialty and Personal Instruction School in the B-3 General Commercial and Office District, as required under Chapter 19-06 Commercial Districts and Chapter 19-10 Use Regulations, at 710 S. Milwaukee Avenue, within the multi-tenant office building located at 700-728 S. Milwaukee Avenue, Wheeling, Illinois, in accordance with the following plans:

- Program description and schedule received 12.27.2006
- Unit floor plan received 12.27.2006

And with the following conditions:

1. That three parking spaces near the front door to the unit be dedicated for the use of the specific unit;
2. That the petitioner decrease the number of students or increase the number of bathroom fixtures in order to meet the requirements of the Illinois Plumbing Code;
3. That the petitioner shall operate in accordance with the program description received December 27, 2006; and
4. That children shall be limited to a maximum of 3 hours per day.

On the roll call, the vote was as follows:

AYES: Commissioners Boime, Lang, Malandrino, Ruffatto, Steilen
NAYS: Commissioner Didier
ABSENT: Commissioner Dorband
PRESENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

There being five affirmative votes, the motion was approved.

Commissioner Boime moved, seconded by Commissioner Ruffatto to close Docket No. 2006-42. The motion was approved by a voice vote.

- F)** Previous Docket Nos. PC 06-23 and SCBA 06-49
AutoZone
850 West Dundee Road
(PC 06-23) Appearance Approval of Roof Style
(SCBA 06-49) Appearance Approval of Business Identification Wall and
Freestanding Signs

Mr. Peter Hallam, Attorney and Mr. Dean Chowanec, Reger Development were present.

Mr. Hallam referred to the vacant, unattractive and former medical building site. He reported the proposed building was a prototypical building for AutoZone and was a permitted use and complied 100% with the Village Code and was entirely consistent with the Village's Comprehensive Plan. He explained that after they made the initial proposal, the Village demanded they provide an additional 17' of right-of-way on Dundee Road for a Village accommodation. He felt they went above and beyond what the Code provides. They submitted a revised site plan in order to provide for the required 17' right-of-way and it was necessary for them to seek variances for parking setback, rear yard setback and the sign setback. They also submitted revised building elevations, taking into consideration the fence screening for the residential neighbors, landscaping, setback and building appearance. He referred to a project located nearby that had been recently approved at Lake Cook and Weiland Roads, which also abuts a residential property. He felt the recently approved building was very similar to their prototypical AutoZone building that was first proposed. He provided renderings of both buildings. He explained they went above and beyond and made substantial changes showing what had been approved at another property compared to what they were proposing and they had received a no vote from the Plan Commission. They believe the main issue was a pole sign versus a monument sign. He noted there were numerous pole signs in the specific area and pole signs were allowed under the current Code. They went to the Village Board and addressed a number of requirements the Village placed upon them concerning the operations of the store (hours, deliveries, sign colors, content of sign, additional signage) and they still received a no vote based on two additional requirements imposed by the Village Board. He indicated the Village Board had imposed a requirement for a monument sign and some members of the Board would further require a mansard style roof before supporting the project.

As a follow-up to the no vote, Mr. Hallam sought a motion to reconsider to the Village Board but explained the Village Board directed them back to the Plan Commission. He felt they exceeded the requirements of the Village Board and went above and beyond the provisions of the Village Code and were now proposing a monument sign and an elevation with a mansard style roof. He explained they had gone from a standard metal seamed roof to a faux slate shingle mansard roof.

He felt it was more in keeping with the residential area next door. Samples of the materials were provided at the meeting. Mr. Hallam stated they have gone as far as they possibly could go. He reiterated they have met all of the Code requirements and additional requests and demands.

Commissioner Steilen watched the Village Board meeting and had expressed concern what exact building was proposed at that time. He provided copies of two different buildings that had been presented in the past. Mr. Hallam explained it was the same building but had different colors due to the printer. Commissioner Steilen apologized because he was confused as to what buildings were actually being presented. Mr. Hallam explained it was the same elevation with a different color. Mr. Hallam explained they only proposed one building to the Village Board. Commissioner Steilen thought he had seen two. He referred to previously proposed side windows and noted they were no longer proposed. He questioned if the petitioner would be willing to add the windows back. Mr. Hallam explained they would now fall below the sight line of the neighbors given the requirements they needed to meet concerning the fencing. He explained they were always fake windows. Commissioner Steilen felt it gave architectural detail and character to the side of the building. Mr. Hallam believes the mansard roof material satisfied it and added a substantial cost to the project.

Commissioner Steilen liked the original building design with the faux windows.

Commissioner Steilen believed the site plan had changed a couple of times. He referred to the proposed lighting standards in the parking lot that faced away from the residential and toward the building. He was unable to determine if the current site plan included them. Mr. Chowaniec confirmed they had not changed their photometric plan, which provided zero lumens at the lot line. Mr. Chowaniec noted the locations of the lighting poles on the plan. Commissioner Steilen requested it get marked as an exhibit. Mr. Jennings noted the petitioner had a full set of materials attached to the ordinance. Commissioner Steilen understood but still requested it as an exhibit.

Commissioner Steilen referred to the subject of potential parking of AutoZone trucks or delivery trucks on the property. He noted the petitioner had previously agreed there would be no deliveries and would not have AutoZone trucks on the property. Commissioner Steilen wanted to include no parking of AutoZone delivery trucks as a condition.

Commissioner Steilen felt the mansard roof design would go with the area but preferred the original style of building. He requested the original windows be added back to the side of the building.

Commissioner Didier watched the Village Board meeting. She mentioned she had heard requests for a pitched roof, similar to the building located in Cary. She has since seen the pitched roof building and did not understand why the petitioner was being stubborn about putting it in. Mr. Hallam explained it was not something that AutoZone typically does on a routine basis because of maintenance and construction issues. Commissioner Didier questioned how the other Villages got the pitched roof since the building in Arizona was brand new. Mr. Hallam explained there were some climate issues that were different. He reiterated that the prototypical building did not allow it.

In reply to Commissioner Ruffatto's question, Mr. Chowaniec confirmed the slate material had a 50-year warranty.

Commissioner Ruffatto questioned the type of white material that was shown over the front entrance in the previous December 21 packet. Mr. Chowaniec confirmed it was the EIFS material and was not high maintenance as long as it was kept up high. He confirmed it was not painted. A sample was provided at the meeting. Commissioner Ruffatto noted it appeared speckled in the drawings. Mr. Chowaniec explained it was white with a texture and that the printer made it appear speckled.

Commissioner Ruffatto referred to the proposed condition of adding the address to the sign. Mr. Chowaniec agreed to it.

Commissioner Ruffatto referred to the proposed condition of reducing the letter height of the wall sign to 36". Mr. Chowaniec believed the sign would appear too small against the large area with 36" letters. He indicated they had removed a graphic. He noted the proposed size did meet the Village Code. Mr. Jennings explained the graphic issue was a discussion Staff had with the Memphis corporate office a year ago and the AutoZone graphic was slightly larger than what was permitted. At the time, they thought they could reduce the size of their graphic in order to meet the percent cap but later determined they were not able to reduce it.

Commissioner Boime indicated he had previously voted in favor of the design and liked the original roofline instead of the proposed mansard roof.

Commissioner Boime referred to the faux windows; he had originally pushed hard for them on the previous design but did not believe they were needed with the current roofline.

Commissioner Boime did not believe it was necessary to reduce the size of the lettering on the wall sign. He was comfortable with the proposed monument sign.

Commissioner Malandrino had no additional comments.

Commissioner Boime referred to the building in Cary that had excessive external electrical outlets in front of the building. He was not in favor of having them on the proposed building. Mr. Hallam indicated they did not intend to have them unless there was a Code requirement.

Chairman Lang mentioned he had watched the Village Board meeting and heard about the delivery trucks and pitched roof.

Chairman Lang appreciated the mansard roof but requested an explanation as to what the maintenance issues were regarding a pitched roof. He preferred a pitched roof since it would fit better with the residential neighbors. He felt a mansard roof made the building appear outdated. Mr. Hallam explained it related to cost and a pitched roof required more maintenance. He felt it was consistent with what they understood the Village Board was requesting.

Chairman Lang referred to the EIFS accent band. He noted it was originally a renaissance stone and was changed. He was unsure how the EIFS accent band would look. He preferred the original stone. Mr. Chowaniec agreed to discuss it with AutoZone. Chairman Lang requested adding it as a condition to the motion.

Commissioner Steilen questioned if there were any special fire requirements for the building such as a cat walk. Mr. Jennings was unsure of the exact Fire Department requirements. Mr. Hallam confirmed the mansard was above the roofline.

Commissioner Ruffatto questioned if the letter height for the wall sign needed to be reduced.

Chairman Lang took a poll. The entire Commission did not believe it was necessary to reduce the lettering size for the wall sign.

Commissioner Ruffatto questioned if a condition should be added regarding not permitting parking of AutoZone trucks. Commissioner Steilen was in favor of adding a condition.

Mr. Jennings noted that the motion referred to a prairie lantern light. Mr. Chowaniec was in agreement.

Commissioner Ruffatto suggested a poll regarding Commissioner Steilen's suggestion of adding faux windows.

Commissioner Malandrino: not in favor
Commissioner Boime: not in favor
Commissioner Ruffatto: not in favor
Commissioner Didier: not in favor
Commissioner Steilen: in favor
Chairman Lang: not in favor

The vote was 5-1 not in favor of adding faux windows.

Commissioner Ruffatto referred to the suggested condition regarding changing the EIFS band to renaissance stone. Commissioner Boime suggested changing material number 5 to number 1 on drawing E-2 in order to incorporate it.

Commissioner Boime moved, seconded by Commissioner Ruffatto to recommend approval of Previous Docket No. PC 06-23 Building Appearance Approval (associated with site plan approval) for a New Retail Building as shown on the following plans:

- Sheet A2 Exterior Elevations prepared by AutoZone Inc. (South and West Elevations) submitted 1.3.2007 by Reger Development LLC
- Sheet A2.1 Exterior Elevations prepared by AutoZone Inc. (North and East Elevations) submitted 1.3.2007 by Reger Development LLC
- Prairie Lantern wall-mounted light fixture specifications received 11.3.2006

With the following conditions

- Changing the EIFS band to renaissance stone (material #5 to match material #1)
- AutoZone trucks are not permitted to park on the property

On the roll call, the vote was as follows:

AYES: Commissioners Boime, Didier, Malandrino, Ruffatto, Steilen
NAYS: Chairman Lang
ABSENT: Commissioner Dorband
PRESENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

There being five affirmative votes, the motion was approved.

Commissioner Steilen moved, seconded by Commissioner Boime to approve Previous Docket No. SCBA 06-49 Appearance Review of Business Identification Wall Sign and a Freestanding Monument Sign as shown on the following exhibits prepared by AutoZone, Inc for a new AutoZone location at 850 West Dundee Road, Wheeling, Illinois;

- Sheet SN1, Sign Graphics and Specifications for Business Identification Wall Sign received November 3, 2006
- Sheet SN3, Sign Graphics and Specifications for a Freestanding Monument Sign received December 14, 2006

- Sheet LP-1, Landscaping Plan received December 14, 2006
- Sheet LP-2, Landscaping Plan Details received December 14, 2006
- Sheet A2.1, Exterior Elevations prepared by AutoZone Inc. (North and East Elevations) submitted 1.3.2007 by Reger Development LLC, with sign material details indicated

With the following condition:

1. That the address is added to the base of the sign.

On the roll call, the vote was as follows:

AYES: Commissioners Boime, Didier, Malandrino, Ruffatto, Steilen
NAYS: Chairman Lang
ABSENT: Commissioner Dorband
PRESENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

There being five affirmative votes, the motion was approved.

- G)** Workshop Discussion
Residential Town Home Area of a
Proposed Mixed Use PUD (Town Homes and Office)
431 North Wolf Road / 502-516 North Milwaukee Avenue

Mr. Gary Levitas was present for the workshop. The architect arrived halfway into the discussion.

Mr. Levitas recapped what they had done since the last meeting on December 14. They have worked to address all of the issues and concerns. He felt they had been able to review and modify the plans in order to satisfy all of the Commission's concerns.

- Redesigned layout of subdivision in order to accommodate the pedestrian sidewalks throughout and provide additional guest parking;
- Widened the street and extended the driveways to gain additional on-street parking;
- Decreased the density from 64 units to 60;
- Added adequate porches and front step areas;
- Added more brick on both the 2-story and 3-story homes;
- Lined up Meyerson Street with their driveway
- Provided a bike path & walkway to potentially connect the development to the site for the next phase of the project;

Mr. Levitas noted that the Wolf Road townhome development would be the first phase of their development which would also include a retail/commercial building off of Milwaukee Avenue. They have started to work on developing the concept for Milwaukee Avenue. They are in negotiations with the land owners adjacent to the property and trying to extend the frontage along Milwaukee Avenue.

Commissioner Malandrino questioned if the petitioner had considered single-family homes or high rise condominiums for the site. Mr. Levitas reported that initially when they looked at the site they looked at different possibilities. After a market review, they felt the townhome development would be more marketable in the area. He referred to the new condominiums that are located near the

property. Realtors have told him the area is good for a townhome development. He indicated that 40% of the proposed townhomes would offer a first floor master bedroom.

In reply to Commissioner Malandrino's question, Mr. Levitas stated the approximate selling price of the homes would start in the low 400's. The size of the homes would be 2,200-2,400 square feet, not including the basements. He felt their product was far superior to any of their competition in the area. They will offer hardwood flooring throughout with granite/marble finishes as standard.

Commissioner Boime felt the proposed plan had a better layout. He questioned if the interior walkways were cobblestone. Commissioner Boime expressed concern having a bumpy surface when children rode their bikes. Mr. Levitas suggested using stamped concrete.

Commissioner Boime understood the rationale behind row homes and town homes. He was in favor of increasing density in the area but noted there were already a lot of multiple family homes in the Village.

Commissioner Ruffatto liked the drawings but expressed concern with another townhome development in the Village. He was not in favor of the proposed development.

Commissioner Didier preferred upscale single-family homes in the area. She wanted to see more green space in order to provide an opportunity for the neighbors to get to know each other and provide a walking area.

She agreed the proposed plan was upscale and the petitioner had given the Commission what they had asked for. She preferred the original plan that included meandering streets. She questioned if the layout of the streets could be changed if the density was reduced. Mr. Levitas explained there was a lot of stepping in and out throughout the development. He referred to single-family homes and explained that the trend was for more townhomes. He wanted to improve the area and felt it was the first step for changing the triangle. He stated that single-family homes on the site did not make economic sense. He felt the proposed development was the best use for the site. Mr. Levitas was surprised that a single-family development was brought up since no one had mentioned it in the past.

Commissioner Steilen expressed concern for the proposed two roads that appeared to go nowhere. He questioned if the roads were to be continued. Mr. Levitas explained that the proposed development would not be part of the development on Milwaukee Avenue. The current plan for Milwaukee Avenue is for commercial and a 5-story office building. They are trying to acquire additional properties in order to make it a grander and bigger development.

Commissioner Steilen was not in favor of having stub roads in the development since they usually never get connected. He preferred having cul-de-sacs. In reply to Commissioner Steilen's question, Mr. Levitas confirmed the streets were private. Mr. Levitas agreed he could change the stub roads to cul-de-sacs if requested.

Mr. Levitas stated that the proposed development would not be inter-connected with the development on Milwaukee Avenue.

Chairman Lang liked the plan but expected more for the entire area. He was not in favor of having two disjointed properties. Chairman Lang referred to a recent redevelopment concept from Meyer Avenue going north to encompass the entire peninsula. The plan included office buildings, retail and condo buildings in the center. He wanted to see more properties acquired in order to provide a

maximum of 2-3 parcels divided equally. Chairman Lang questioned if the petitioner's piece could work with the other proposal. Mr. Levitas indicated he had seen Mark Smith's plan and agreed he could work with it. He felt this proposal could be the first step for the improvements. He wants the Village to get involved. He indicated that he is currently trying to acquire the property next door. He felt his plan would create a balance between the retail and residential. Chairman Lang wanted help from the petitioner to provide a plan for the entire area.

Mr. Dziekiewicz, architect, arrived.

Mr. Dziekiewicz provided a rendering of the office building off of Milwaukee Avenue. He agreed it would be treated as a separate entity. He felt it would beautify the Village. Chairman Lang wanted more property involved in the plan. Mr. Levitas agreed to get started on acquiring more properties. He reiterated that the Village needed to get involved and help them out. He asked the Commission to allow them to make the first step.

Mr. Levitas stated that he has a great track record and referred to his developments within the City of Chicago.

Mr. Levitas referred to the office building. He explained that residential needed to be included in order for it to make economic sense. He noted they had already decreased the density off of Wolf Road from 64 to 60 units. Chairman Lang wants to see an overlay of the master plan. Mr. Levitas explained it would include the townhomes off of Wolf Road and continue with commercial and office space off of Milwaukee Avenue. Mr. Levitas was discouraged because they have spent so much time and there are always new obstacles when they return to the Village.

Commissioner Steilen wanted to see an outline with a wish list of what it might grow into. Chairman Lang agreed; he wanted to see how an overall plan would look. Mr. Levitas explained that the Village needs to get involved in order for them to move northward, otherwise it would take years. He was willing to help out but explained the real picture needed to be reviewed.

Commissioner Ruffatto referred to the minutes from the last meeting and noted there had been concern expressed regarding the density issue. He felt it was unfair for the petitioner to say he was surprised at the mention of single-family homes. Mr. Levitas knew there was a concern regarding density but was unaware that anyone felt the townhomes would not fit and would prefer single-family homes.

Commissioner Boime did not believe single-family homes would be built along Wolf Road. He felt the proposed development was appropriate for the general area and agreed the petitioner should proceed unless the majority of the Commission was not in agreement.

Mr. Levitas agreed to come back on February 8th with minor adjustments. He felt he addressed all of the issues from the last meeting.

Chairman Lang requested that the petitioner explain why single-family homes would not work for the site. Mr. Levitas explained he was originally going to propose a high-rise/mid-rise condominium building when they first started looking at the property. After discussions with realtors and marketers they decided townhomes would be the best fit for the property. Single-family homes would be priced out of range for the area and would not be suitable. Chairman Lang liked the plan but wants to see more of the bigger plan. He was unsure of what else would go into the peninsula. Chairman Lang agreed the Village needed to get involved.

Mr. Levitas agreed to draw up a plan for the master plan, which he will present at the next meeting but could not guarantee the plan would happen. He stated that the current development could take place now. He questioned if the Commission would prefer to keep what is on the property now and wait until someone else came along.

In response to Commissioner Boime's question, Mr. Levitas agreed to provide Staff with the developments he has done in Chicago, Brookfield and Oak Park.

Commissioner Ruffatto voiced his disappointment with Staff and the Village Board about reviewing items first prior to going to the Plan Commission. He felt it put the Commission in an awkward position if they weren't in favor of it. He mentioned it was not the first time it had happened.

Commissioner Malandrino was in favor of single-family homes in the Village but didn't think it was the petitioner's responsibility to come up with the triangle plan. He felt it was up to the Village Planner, the Plan Commission and Village Trustees. He agreed single-family homes were not right for the site. He liked the quality of the proposed development and price range. He felt it was unrealistic to make the petitioner come up with the big plan for something he didn't own.

Commissioner Steilen referred to the Comprehensive Plan for the area. He noted the Comprehensive Plan did not call for single-family housing on the property. He suggested changing the Comprehensive Plan if the proposed kind of development wasn't what the Village wanted. Commissioner Steilen was in favor of asking the petitioner to come up with a rough sketch of the "pipe dream" for the site. Mr. Levitas was in agreement.

Commissioner Didier felt the townhomes were beautiful. She expressed concern for the grid. She preferred curvy streets. Commissioner Boime indicated that a grid was safer for pedestrians and bicycles. Mr. Dziekiewicz explained the buildings were offset and would not appear in a straight line. Mr. Dziekiewicz mentioned the Fire Department needed room for access. He explained the change allowed the row homes to face the center green space. He felt the current development was a better product compared to the original plan thanks to Staff.

Mr. Dziekiewicz reported the current plan allowed 50% of the units to have a first floor master bedroom. All of the townhomes have full basements and have an average of 2,200 square feet.

In reply to Commissioner Ruffatto's question, Mr. Dziekiewicz confirmed the buildings were brick except for a colored accent piece.

In reply to Chairman Lang's question, Mr. Jennings reported the Fire Department would not allow fencing because of access issues. Chairman Lang was not in favor of fencing.

In reply to Chairman Lang's question, Mr. Levitas confirmed the proposed ponds were still included on the current plan.

Chairman Lang took a poll regarding the project moving forward.

Commissioner Malandrino: In favor of proposed plans for townhome development and office building.

Commissioner Boime: Move ahead.

Commissioner Ruffatto: Not in favor; prefers single-family homes.

Commissioner Didier: In favor of moving forward. She suggested adding a meeting space in the center of the development.

Commissioner Steilen: Move forward as long as it fits with the rest of the area.

Chairman Lang: On the fence because he liked the overall plan but needed to see how it would fit in with the overall master plan.

Mr. Levitas agreed to work with the Village and will come up with a “dreamscape” for the area.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES December 14, 2006
December 21, 2006

Commissioner Boime moved, seconded by Commissioner Steilen, to approve the minutes dated December 14, 2006 with the following corrections:

- Change transient to transit
- Page 15 – change row to road in the second to last paragraph

The motion was approved by a voice vote.

Commissioner Steilen moved, seconded by Commissioner Ruffatto, to approve the minutes dated December 21, 2006 as proposed. The motion was approved by a voice vote.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Jennings referred to the Wheeling Station PUD. He referred to a previous comment that was made at the last meeting to tone down the architecture. He provided a rendering with a “toned down” look removing the decorative roof features above the retail area. He questioned if the proposed drawing was acceptable.

Commissioner Boime did not have a problem with the original design.

Commissioner Didier did not have a problem with the original design.

Chairman Lang mentioned that it was his previous comment but now agreed with the original drawing.

Commissioner Ruffatto was still not in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Jennings referred to the Walgreens on Schoenbeck and Dundee. Walgreens has been in discussions with Staff regarding a modification to their drive-thru area. They want an intercom behind the existing intercom in order to be able to take an order if there were two cars waiting at the same time. Staff is trying to determine if it would constitute a change from the Special Use because it would be adding on to their drive-thru lane or would it be considered a minor change. Staff had struggled with the decision since there had been a history with the drive-thru Special Use when it went through the Public Hearing process which was a difficult process.

In reply to Commissioner Boime’s question, Mr. Jennings confirmed it was a freestanding post that was in front of the building but not attached. There is no window, only a small sign. The post is 7” wide and 7” deep.

Commissioner Boime felt it was a great idea.

Commissioner Steilen suggested finding out how many complaints there had been regarding the existing intercom.

Chairman Lang suggested it was a good time to resolve any landscaping issues. Commissioner Steilen noted they were supposed to have shrubs covering the headlights but they were never planted. Commissioner Steilen suggested reviewing the original approved landscaping plan.

Mr. Jennings felt it was a gray area whether it was a major or minor change based on the previous history but that staff was inclined to require the special use approval.

Commissioner Steilen felt it would be a minor change if there were no outstanding noise complaints.

Mr. Jennings suggested a poll since there was a big difference between a building permit and Public Hearing.

Commissioner Steilen: Abstained until there was more information.

Commissioner Didier: Minor change if there were no outstanding complaints.

Commissioner Ruffatto: He was confused since the landscaping issue was brought up. He felt it should be a major Special Use change in order to have the petitioner address the landscaping issues.

Commissioners Steilen and Didier changed their votes to a major Special Use change.

Commissioner Boime: Major change.

Commissioner Ruffatto: Major change.

Chairman Lang: Major change.

Commissioner Didier announced she would not be present at the February 8th meeting.

Commissioner Boime mentioned there was another collection box at the corner of the Tahoe Marathon lot. He suggested adding an ordinance to make the boxes illegal. Mr. Jennings explained the interpretation of the current Ordinance does not permit them since they were considered a structure that is not an accessory to the principle use of the property.

Chairman Lang mentioned there were ruts in the new sod by the new fencing located far west on Dundee Road.

Commissioner Lang wanted to include a discussion next week regarding the Village entrance signs by the borders of the railroad tracks.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Boime moved, seconded by Commissioner Ruffatto to adjourn the meeting at 9:53 p.m. All were in favor on a unanimous voice vote and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Ruffatto, Secretary
Wheeling Plan Commission

**MINUTES E-MAILED TO THE PC ON 1-18-07
FOR APPROVAL AT THE PC MEETING 1-25-07**